



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

moral obligations. As a result of new means of communication and transportation the world has become smaller, if I may so put it, and the nations have been brought in closer contact with each other. Another reason why the best sentiment of the world should, without further delay, be crystallized into rules of international law is that at present the High Court at The Hague is actually without a system of laws to apply to causes which may be submitted to it for adjudication. This being the case, the several nations, if they were really sincere when they created the Hague Court, should at the coming Conference regard it as their imperative duty to supply, in the shape of a body of laws, a foundation upon which that great tribunal is to rest.

The interparliamentary plan comprises a few additional demands. The Union pleads for a discussion of the question of the limitation of armaments, of the bombardment of undefended ports, towns, and villages, a definition of contraband of war, and a definition of the rights and duties of neutrals, etc. Definite agreements as to these questions are highly desirable; yet I hope the Conference will not permit its time to be monopolized by them to the exclusion of those questions which I have just discussed and which the majority of the friends of peace regard as of infinitely greater importance. It is safe to say that neither the American people nor the people of any other country will be satisfied if their governments should allow the Hague Conference to degenerate into a mere pow-wow for the regulation of war instead of its being a Congress of Nations convened for the purpose of laying the foundation for more permanent peace. The British government, it is said, will insist on a discussion of the advisability of limiting armaments, and expects the delegates from the United States to support its demand. But this is not primarily an American but a European question, and while our delegates could not well object to the discussion, yet we expect them to press for the consideration of the propositions which make for peace rather than those which pertain to the manner of warfare. Under any kind of an arrangement the permissible total of armaments would have to be fixed according to population or the volume of international trade, and in either case the United States could go on expanding, while on that basis Great Britain would be obliged to contract. The truth has already dawned upon the governments of Continental Europe, hence the report that they are raising objections even to a discussion of the question.

Thus it may fall to the lot of the United States to save the life of the second Hague Conference as it helped to save the first. I could not imagine my country in a more exalted rôle. With all the countries of Central and South America participating, America will be a tremendous factor at The Hague, because in all measures vouchsafing peace these countries are willing and anxious to follow the lead of President Roosevelt and his great Secretary of State, Elihu Root. The second Hague Conference was originally called by President Roosevelt at the behest of the Interparliamentary Union, and in that call the resolution of the Union upon which the President's sanction was based was communicated in full to all the governments of the world. It demanded the negotiation of a general arbitration treaty between all the powers and the creation of an interna-

tional congress. The inference is that this has committed the American government to a certain extent to these two vital propositions, which, besides — I mention it with justifiable pride — are of American origin and were first proposed by members of the American Congress at the first meeting which the Interparliamentary Union ever held on American soil. It required two more conferences of the Union before the parliamentarians of Europe acceded to and adopted them, with some slight modifications, as the most vital part of their program for the next Hague Conference.

Under these circumstances I hold that we cannot take a backward step now and disappoint the world by failing to make the next great Council of Nations produce results proportional to the possibilities of this hour and to the rightful place of the United States in the politics of the world. On the contrary, I believe I voice the sentiment of this Congress when I repeat what I said in a letter to President Roosevelt: that the prestige which he has obtained throughout the world by his successful intervention in the war between Russia and Japan, and by other acts in bringing the Hague Court into operation, points to him as the Chief Executive who should lead in espousing these great reforms for the benefit of mankind, and thus achieve more glory in one day than could be gained on a dozen battlefields in a hundred years.

The Limitation of Armaments.*

The Position of the United States at the Hague Conference.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

The American people are learning that they have in Elihu Root a Secretary of State not inferior to John Hay in the breadth of his international outlook and in his constructive statesmanship. Long recognized by many, whether or not they approved his policies, as intellectually the ablest man in the cabinet and in his party, it has been in his conduct of foreign affairs that he has manifested an order of greatness which many had not divined, and which has commanded the admiration and gratitude of thoughtful and earnest men of all parties alike. The conception, conduct and results of his recent tour of the South American capitals, signalized by a series of addresses incomparable in their tact, wisdom and nobility, marked a new era in the relations of the United States with the southern republics. His address before the American Society of International Law in April was the abundant justification of his election to the presidency of this new organization, so full of promise and potency for good to America and to the world. His address at the opening of the National Peace Congress in New York immediately before, although certainly not superior in loftiness and humanity of spirit to the address by Mr. Hay at the International Congress in Boston in 1904, was far superior to it in the way of distinct practical and constructive counsel; in its emphasis especially upon the necessity of lifting international arbitration out of the spirit of diplomacy into that of jurisprudence, and upon the duty of the nations, and in the first place of our own nation, for which we are immediately responsible, to address themselves earnestly at the coming Hague Conference to the question of the

* Abridgment of a pamphlet published June 20, copies of which may be had on application to the American Peace Society.

general restriction of armaments. His word upon this subject was the most pronounced expression which has been given of the position of our government, and, as the hour for action now approaches, it is important for every one of us carefully to consider it. Said Mr. Root:

"The first Hague Conference adopted two resolutions relating to naval and military armament. The first was: 'The Conference is of opinion that the restriction of military charges, which are at present a heavy burden on the world, is extremely desirable for the increase of the material and moral welfare of mankind.' The second was: 'The Conference expresses the wish that the governments, taking into consideration the proposals made at the Conference, may examine the possibility of an agreement as to the limitation of armed forces by land and sea and of war budgets.' The government of the United States has been of the opinion that the subject-matter of these resolutions ought to be further considered and discussed in the second Conference; that the subject is in the nature of unfinished business and cannot be ignored, but must be dealt with; that there ought to be at least an earnest effort to reach, or to make progress toward reaching, some agreement under which the enormous expenditure of money and the enormous withdrawal of men from productive industry for warlike purposes may be reduced or arrested or retarded. . . . There are serious difficulties in formulating any definite proposal which would not be objectionable to some of the powers, and upon the question whether any specific proposal is unfair and injurious to its interests each power must be, and is entitled to be, its own judge. Nevertheless, the effort can be made; it may fail in this Conference, as it failed in the first; but if it fails, one more step will have been taken toward ultimate success. Long-continued and persistent effort is always necessary to bring mankind into conformity with great ideals; every great advance that civilization has made on its road from savagery has been upon stepping stones of failure, and a good fight bravely lost for a sound principle is always a victory.

The position of the American government, thus impressively declared by Mr. Root, is the same position as that taken by the British government more than a year ago and strongly defended in important public addresses since by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Sir Edward Grey. It is also the position unanimously endorsed by the Interparliamentary Union at its meeting in London last July, where the restriction of armaments was made one of the six measures commended for favorable action to the coming Hague Conference. The report upon this subject which formed the basis of the discussion by the Interparliamentary Union was prepared by Baron D'Estournelles de Constant, who went so far as to say: "All the other items of the Conference program will be insignificant compared with the limitation of armaments, for which the whole world is waiting." The great Peace Congress in New York in April unanimously endorsed the position of Secretary Root, adopting in its platform the following declaration:

"Whereas, The first Hague Conference, though it failed to solve the question of reduction of armaments, for which it was primarily called, unanimously recommended to the powers the serious study of the problem with the view of relieving the people of the vast burdens imposed upon them by rivalry of armaments;

"Resolved, That the time has arrived for decided action towards the limitation of the burdens of armaments, which have enormously increased since 1899, and the government of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to instruct its delegates to the coming Hague Conference to support, with the full weight of our national influence, the proposition of the British government as announced by the Prime Minister, to have, if possible, the subject of armaments considered by the Conference."

THE MOHONK CONFERENCE IN 1907 AND 1908.

I believe this resolution truly represents the great body

of American peace workers. Much publicity has been given the fact that the recent Mohonk Arbitration Conference, a month after the New York Congress, voted against a similar resolution. This action was undoubtedly a great surprise to the country, but its significance has been exaggerated. This was one of the four principal measures urged in the Mohonk platform last year, the other three being the establishment of a regular international parliament, a general arbitration treaty, and the immunity of private property at sea from capture in time of war. These three were again approved in the present year's platform, but the approval of the other, strangely, was refused. It was indeed surprising, and, coming on the eve of the Hague Conference, when our government should have behind it there the resolute support of every American worker for peace, to many a discouraging thing. But it was by no means so important as opponents of the position of Mr. Root and the government have tried to make out.

The action of the Conference, by a small majority, was, in the first place, in direct contradiction of its action last year, and this when the demand for approval of the measure has become far more evident and far more imperative than a year ago. The action last year was unanimous, after thorough discussion, and apparently the expression of profound feeling; yet either last year's thought and feeling or this year's were clearly, on the part of many, superficial, determined by slight and momentary considerations. I think it could quickly be shown that it was last year's action which expressed deliberate judgment, and a report of the discussion would justify the claim for Mohonk as the supporter and not the opposer of the American and English policy. Not only was the strong resolution unanimously passed at the close of the Conference: the urgent necessity of the general restriction of armaments, and of the special duty of the United States to coöperate with England in effort to this end, was the dominant and distinguishing subject of last year's session. The president of the Conference was Hon. John W. Foster, and he struck the keynote of the session in his opening speech, saying:

"The subject which Russia did not feel warranted in suggesting I feel confident will be inserted in the program. In fact, it has already been anticipated by President Roosevelt, by the reference he made in his last annual message to the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea and of military budgets, as one of the matters of business undisposed of in 1899 and desirable to be considered in the new Conference. I earnestly hope our government will follow up the indication made in the message of the President, and that its delegates to The Hague will take the lead in bringing about an agreement among the great powers for a limitation, and, if possible, a reduction in armaments."

It is an occasion for profound satisfaction and gratitude that Mr. Foster is a member of the Hague Conference this summer, when the time has come to give effect to this demand. It ought not to be forgotten here, as we cite this strong declaration by the president of last year's Mohonk Conference, that the president of this year's Conference, President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, spoke as follows in considering in his opening address the subjects which should be commended for attention at The Hague: "We may profitably urge the wisdom of formal international consideration of the possibility of restricting the further growth of the great armies and navies of the world without impairing the

efficiency of those that exist. The present British government has taken a most praiseworthy stand on this subject." It is important to cite this word of President Butler's, because a statement has been published implying that he took the contrary position at Mohonk — a statement growing out of the very common and mischievous confusion of the question of disarmament and that of the reduction of armaments. Similarly Hon. John D. Long has been widely reported in the newspapers as opposed to the effort for restriction at The Hague, and as even having "led the opposition" to the resolution in its behalf at Mohonk. He heartily approved the resolution, and considered its defeat most unfortunate. His position, like that of President Butler, is in entire accord with that of the American and British governments.

Chief Justice Stiness of Rhode Island, President Faunce of Brown University, Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, Dr. Daniel C. Gilman of Baltimore, Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Hon. Charles S. Hamlin and Mr. Samuel B. Capen of Boston, all vigorously supported Mr. Foster in this noteworthy discussion. Said Mr. Capen:

"We are not here to discuss arbitration in general: that battle has been fought and won. We are here to decide how practically we can make our influence felt in doing something that will be helpful under present conditions. We are all agreed that one of the great evils in the world is the waste that is going on in the expenditures for great armies and great navies. Not only is this burden laid upon nations almost beyond endurance, but there is an infinite peril in having these large armies and navies, for many want to have them used, and it is dangerous to have gunpowder and matches too near together. The time has come when we should no longer add ship to ship and army to army and fort to fort, but a halt should be made and the line should be drawn. The place to do it is at The Hague at the approaching Conference. There was never such an hour, never such an occasion to present this great question. The commission of it by the Czar from the rescript is most significant, and therefore there is all the more need for the United States to press the point that this question shall be in the program."

This sentiment, as the resolution attested, was unanimous, and the hasty vote this year should in no way be regarded at Washington, in the country, or at The Hague as a real expression of American international sentiment or of the serious judgment of Mohonk itself. That judgment rather was reflected in the strong speech and united action of last year, and the real voice of the American peace party was heard in the platform of the great American Peace Congress in New York in April.

THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION.

Far more important, however, than the resolution of the New York Congress upon the restriction of armaments was the address of Secretary Root, giving distinct assurance that the attitude of our government was to be precisely that urged by the Congress, and urged a year before by the Mohonk Conference. In making this memorable statement of the firm and noble position of our government upon this great issue, Secretary Root emphasized the duty and the power of the peace party of the country to create by agitation a public opinion in which the government should find its strongest reinforcement. Students and thinkers, teachers and philosophers, men able to "look upon the world as it ought to be," should "press their views upon the world and insist upon conformity," until a righteous public opinion effects the national purpose which governments represent.

In one word, our Secretary of State gives solemn as-

surance to our peace party and to the world that the government takes the high position touching the restriction of armaments which was so earnestly petitioned for at Mohonk a year ago, and unanimously indorsed at New York in April, and for which our leaders have all persistently labored, and on his part petitions us for such coöperation in the creation of a vigorous public opinion as shall reinforce the government in its position, as its representatives go to The Hague on their difficult mission; and there can be no question as to the duty and the disposition of the United American peace party in response to the call. Every careless action tantamount to a vote of lack of confidence in the government's position must be ignored; and it is doubly incumbent upon every peace worker in the country who stands with Secretary Root and the government in this matter, every one who through voice or pen shapes public opinion, to be outspoken in that support, for the sake of such influence as it may exert upon the country and at The Hague.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S ADDRESSES.

The demand for vigorous speech and action is far more imperative and more evident, I say, to-day than a year ago. The reactionary forces are consolidating, and so are the forces of progress. Great Britain spoke, through her Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary and the unanimous vote of the House of Commons, more than a year ago, and she has spoken since with power. Other nations have followed our own in declaring their support of her position. To the question of armaments Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman chiefly addressed himself in his speech at the opening of the Interparliamentary Conference in London in July, and two months ago he said:

"The disposition shown by certain powers, of whom Great Britain is one, to raise the question of the limitation of armaments at the approaching Hague Conference, has evoked some objections both at home and abroad, on the ground that such action would be ill-timed, inconvenient, and mischievous. I hold these objections to be baseless. The original Conference at The Hague was convened for the purpose of raising this very question. It was not to be expected that agreement on so delicate and complex a matter would be reached at the first attempt; it is the business of those who are opposed to the renewal of the attempt to show that some special and essential change of circumstances has arisen, such as to render unnecessary, inopportune, or mischievous a course adopted with general approbation in 1898. Nothing of the kind has been attempted. It was desirable in 1898 to lighten the burden of armaments; but that consummation is not less desirable to-day, when the weight of the burden has been enormously increased. In 1898 it was already perceived that the endless multiplication of the engines of war was futile and self-defeating; and the years that have passed have only served to strengthen and intensify that impression."

The demand for discussion at The Hague of the limitation of armaments is not simply the demand of the English and American governments. It is the demand, let us not forget, of the Interparliamentary Union, that great body of two thousand of the world's practical legislators, members of the parliaments of the various nations, which constitutes to-day the leading organized force in the peace movement, and which alike by its conservatism and its courage has earned the right to demand of the world's peace-workers that they shall not refuse to follow where it leads.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES AND THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

The Interparliamentary Union did not put the demand

for discussion of the restriction of armaments by the Hague Conference into its London platform last July without careful consideration. The report upon the subject which formed the basis of its debate and action was made by Baron D'Estournelles de Constant, and I know of no other recent discussion of the limitation of armaments so comprehensive or so cogent as this. Baron D'Estournelles is the head of the Arbitration Group in the French Assembly. He was one of the French delegates at the first Hague Conference, and will go also to the second. No man in Europe or in the world speaks on these subjects more responsibly or wisely. Baron D'Estournelles urged the importance of the subject at the New York Peace Congress in April, and in an article in one of the last numbers of the *Outlook* (May 25) he returns to it. Whether the Hague Conference can at this session do anything decisive toward the solution of the problem or not, he says, it should discuss it and urge its consideration upon the different governments. Its discussion "will be a new warning to the public in general of the importance and the urgency of this problem. The more people think and speak of these burdens, the more fully they realize the necessity of getting rid of them. In any case, it is impossible for the coming Hague Conference to seem to be indifferent to the solution of such a difficulty." It is in his report to the Interparliamentary Union, however, that Baron D'Estournelles fully develops his thought upon the limitation of armaments and the urgency of its consideration at the coming Hague Conference.

"The question of the limitation of armaments [he says] is at the present time unquestionably one of the most pressing of all those which parliaments and governments are called upon to consider. It is put forward by the force of circumstances. As long as it remains unsolved, it may be said that it bars the way to all kinds of reform and arrests the progress of civilization. The Interparliamentary Union, in undertaking the discussion of this question, has responded to a universal desire. It will be upheld by the unanimous agreement of nations if it finds a means of realizing what they are all awaiting, if it can contribute to put a stop, by the mere effort of reason, to a state of affairs which can no longer continue. Let us at least seek support in the force that is at our service, namely, that of public opinion. Let us be its interpreters. It will support us. It is ready and has been tested. The progress realized in the domain of arbitration within the last few years, with the assistance of public opinion, shows us what we can obtain in the domain of the limitation of armaments, which is infinitely more concrete and simple."

"It will suffice to discredit governments," is the solemn warning of Baron D'Estournelles, "if they persist in maintaining such an armed peace as now exists in spite of its unpopularity. An opposition will be formed in all countries against their inaction." "It is not by blind resistance," he says again, "that governments will preserve their authority. It is by their intelligence, by their promptitude in understanding popular aspirations. Those among them who recognize this fact will inherit in universal history the places formerly reserved for conquerors, and their country will owe them more than laurels, namely, prosperity." "The question is urgent. Public patience is being exhausted. The public feels that a conclusion could be arrived at, if desired. It will be grateful to those who act as its interpreters and protest in its name. Let us not wait for it to revolt." He calls attention to the motives of the revolution in Russia and to the growing discontent and growing power of the workingmen's parties in England, France and Germany

"The progress of the most advanced parties in all countries is in proportion to the increase of unproductive expenditure. Everybody recognizes that the limitation of armaments will gradually have as a corollary the reduction of the hours of labor, the reduction of the price of goods, the development of the country, the improvement of transport, of public instruction, of hygiene, and the adoption of social reforms. People calculate what a country might do in the way of constructing railways, bridges, ports, machinery, schools, and museums with merely a part of the money which is devoted to naval and military budgets."

"All the other items in the Hague program" — this is Baron D'Estournelle's sweeping conclusion — "will be insignificant compared with the limitation of armaments, for which the whole world is waiting." If the coming Conference fails to act bravely on this subject, "it will be condemned to avow its impotence and declare its own bankruptcy."

The crushing burden of armaments has grown heavier and heavier in the years which have followed the first Hague Conference. The necessity of somehow putting a limit to the continuous increase has become more evident and more urgent; and happily the practical conditions for a thorough consideration of the problem — which the callers of the first Hague Conference felt to be in no way hopeless in 1898 — are vastly more favorable and promising in 1907. In the first place, the creation of the first Conference itself, the permanent international tribunal, has provided a regular rational recourse for nations having differences, making resort to the arbitrament of arms between those nations unnecessary and criminal in infinitely greater degree than before 1899, and the treaties of obligatory arbitration which have multiplied in these years, until now almost all the European nations have entered into them, immensely strengthens the bond to peaceful procedure.

In the second place, the nations which demand the discussion of the limitation of armaments will come to the second Conference not simply as to the first, with general desires and convictions, but with specific, carefully considered plans, as a definite basis of discussion. It is very easy for captious critics or apologists for inertia to magnify the indefiniteness and impracticability of the propositions of the workers for restriction in 1899. Who is to dictate to Germany about her armaments, says one, with France and Russia armed to the teeth on either side of her? — as if any one, in the words of M. D'Estournelles, "ever imagined a limitation of armaments leading to the destruction of the equilibrium of international forces for the profit of one or more States against others," a limitation, for instance, which did not limit Russia and France precisely as it limited Germany! Mr. Goschen's proposal touching the restriction of the programs of naval construction was by no means an indefinite or unpractical proposal. But the plan now submitted, after months of study and conference, by the important English committee upon the subject, prominent upon which committee are Sir John Macdonell and other eminent international jurists, is much more definite, and it is understood that this plan has been adopted by the English government. It is that nothing shall be said about the size of armies or the number and character of battleships, every government being left free to settle those things as it pleases, but the limitation shall be through the budget, each government agreeing that its annual naval and military appropriations for, say,

the next five years shall not exceed its average annual expenditure during the last five. Here is, at any rate, a perfectly definite proposition. Some may not like it; valid objections may be raised against it; it may be voted down,—but it furnishes a clear, practical basis for discussion. President Roosevelt's proposition, commended in his letter to the New York Peace Congress in April, that the governments should all agree to build no more battleships larger than those now building, is a definite proposition. It certainly does not go very far, but it is definite, and it should be discussed. If but a few slight restrictions such as this were the outcome of discussion, it would be a beginning,—and that is the main thing. If the outcome of discussion were but the creation of an international commission like that suggested by President Eliot, a commission of ten or twelve men of high standing from the leading nations to study together ways and means for the restriction and gradual proportionate reduction of armaments and report definite recommendations to the next subsequent conference, that would be a pregnant and promising beginning. Anything is promising save the dull and dogged determination not to face the problem, to think about it, or discuss it. That alone has in it no hope nor relish of salvation. But if the governments, or any considerable number of them, are in earnest on the subject, then measures can and will be adopted at the approaching Conference far more advanced than such as those here referred to. It is purely a question, as Baron D'Estournelles says with righteous impatience, of the purpose and goodwill of governments.

"Systems are not wanting for limiting armaments by common agreement, without imprudence and without injustice. The bases and the means of a general limitation will be found, if the powers seek them in good faith. But have they tried to find them? No: this inquiry is yet to be made. Up to the present people have confined themselves to the usual negotiations, always opposed to so-called dreams of progress. They wait until public opinion forces them to go ahead; and that is why we should address ourselves to public opinion rather than to governments."

When, however, as in England and America, we are so fortunate as to have our government bravely assume leadership, calling upon the people to follow and reinforce it, it is lamentable if there is any failure to answer the call; and it is doubly mournful if there is failure in the ranks of those who, until the hour of action came, had assumed to lead the government. It is always a little dangerous for the children of light to disparage the children of the world; and when indeed the prophets find the politicians distancing them, they should at any rate clap their hands. Let every American, in this hour of action, stand resolutely by Secretary Root in the high position which he has taken for our government; and let none be haunted by the foolish fear that the American and English governments, in demanding free discussion at The Hague of the world's burdensome armaments, will jeopardize in the slightest degree any other interest with which the Conference will be concerned. That is a very old species of bluff, and should deceive nobody. The consideration of armaments at The Hague in 1899, although nothing came of it, "jeopardized" nothing else; and still less will it do in 1907. Mr. Root is not chiefly notorious as an "academic" person or a "visionary," nor have I heard that Sir Edward Grey is so notorious in England, and they can be quite safely trusted to tack their own boats in any squall, and to retire from the

contest altogether in good form if at any stage that should be the dictate of common sense. They know much better than the uninformed and timid folk how to discount the thousand and one exaggerated rumors of Russia's opposition, or Germany's, to this or that. There is no valid ground for assuming Russia's irreconcilable opposition to such discussion as our government asks for, though there was certainly some reason why she should not raise the issue, in view of the fate of her first proposition; and the assumption of Germany's persistent opposition is chiefly a part of that assumption in many English and, one is sorry to say, American quarters of Germany's general perversity in international matters, which has such slight warrant in fact. Such representatives of Russia and Germany at the Hague Conference as M. Martens and Count Zorn are eminently reasonable men, and they will reasonably consider any proposition seriously urged by America and England, whatever the outcome. There can be no reasonable doubt that Japan will stand with England. Spain stands unreservedly with England and America. Italy is heartily with us in principle, and will be reserved in early action only on political grounds incident to her place in the Triple Alliance. The French foreign minister, M. Pichon, has just publicly declared in the Assembly that France would be ready to consider the question at The Hague, the chief necessity seeming to be a concrete formula. France was prepared not only to discuss the proposal when formulated, but to endeavor also to point out a path for diplomacy in this direction. M. de Pressensé, in the discussion, suggested as a concrete formula either that each country maintain a peace army in proportion to its population, or that each be assigned a maximum sum for military expenditures—this latter being essentially the English proposition. There will be no lack of "formulas" if there is only purpose, and purpose will develop very quickly if public opinion makes itself rightly heard. Nothing is more evident than that the whole wavering mass of uncertainty and indecision waits the clarifying and determining influence of clear thought and vital will, and never was the beckoning of duty and destiny to a great nation at a great juncture more signal than in this pregnant word in the last Paris dispatches: "The international jealousies which must inevitably crop out at The Hague create the distinct impression here that at every crucial moment America, free of European suspicion, is likely to be turned to, to enact the role of peacemaker."

The right and the duty of the United States to take strong initiative at The Hague are preëminent. It is primarily through the action of the United States, not of Russia, that the second Conference meets. The President, in accordance with his promise to the Interparliamentary Union in 1904, sent invitations through Secretary Hay to all the powers to join in such a conference, and received their acceptances, long before the final formal invitations were, by his request and through the President's courtesy, sent out by the Czar of Russia. "The subjects postponed by the Hague Conference" stood first upon the subjects for which the Interparliamentary Union asked and the President promised to urge attention at the second Conference; and the chief subject thus postponed was the limitation of armaments. This the President especially referred to in his annual message in 1905

as one of the matters undisposed of in 1899 which should be considered in the coming Conference. In demanding its consideration now our government redeems its pledge to the Interparliamentary Union, and exercises its right as the real caller of the Conference.

The United States goes into the Conference under conditions peculiarly favorable to her influence and to the special recommendations of Secretary Root. The republics of South America, unrepresented at the first Conference, all go with us into the second; and there is no other man now so popular or so influential with them as Secretary Root. His influence with them will be strengthened by the presence on our delegation of Hon. William I. Buchanan, the leader of our delegations at both of the last two Pan-American Conferences, at Mexico and Rio Janeiro, at both of which he manifested consummate ability in bringing about united and constructive results. Heartily at one with Secretary Root himself, no other could second him so effectually in securing the united coöperation with him at The Hague, in the noble effort which he has at heart, of the South American republics. Moreover, there will be present at The Hague, as one of the official representatives of China, no less a person than our distinguished American diplomat, Hon. John W. Foster, whose long service in China and for China has earned for him a confidence from the Chinese government such as is enjoyed by no other American. His influence in determining the attitude of China and the East upon the great issues to be considered at The Hague will be a unique and paramount influence; and that influence will be exerted constantly and powerfully in behalf of Secretary Root's policy. Mr. Foster is one of the leading American advocates of the restriction and reduction of armaments. It was he, as has been noted here, who was the president of the Mohonk Conference last year, and in his opening address struck the strong note in behalf of restriction, which, endorsed by subsequent speakers and by the unanimous vote at the end, made that conference so memorable. It is not too much to say that Mr. Root, coöperating as he does with England and other nations of Europe, will also have behind him both South America and Asia.

The cause of peace and the advancing organization of the world, like every great cause, is checked and hindered by timid men, who, always willing to chant good purposes if sufficiently vague and general, are never ready for action, and find satisfaction in decorous objections to doing or venturing anything. No talk about lessening or limiting armaments until we have arbitration. That secured, no talk about it until we have an international tribunal, leaving no excuse for trial by battle. That secured, no talk about it until the court is made indefectible in the eye of every Prussian, French and Russian lawyer. That secured, the plea would still be for silence and the *status quo* until there was a better polish on the knocker on the big front door of the Hague court house.

Meantime the great, earnest, struggling, suffering world, the world of workers, the millions conscripted from family and industry to keep the ranks of armed peace full, the men who feel the burden of taxation, the men who "do the dying" when war comes,—to these this question of restricting armaments is no "academic" one. They read in to-day's newspaper that, unless some

rational plan can be devised to check it, Russia is immediately to begin the building of a new \$800,000,000 navy, that England announces her willingness to hold her program of naval construction in abeyance pending possible action at The Hague, that our own Senator Hale and Congressmen Bartholdt and Burton have earnestly urged our government to do the same; and they cannot understand how it is possible, at such a juncture, in the presence of such contingencies, for rational men to counsel postponement of all consideration of the subject, and for governments to confess that they are paralyzed by some mysterious magic, and must be silent.

Thank God, the American government is not silent. Silence and inaction in the face of difficulties, however complex, is not the American way. The American way is to do things. Two generations ago it was the American delegates in European peace congresses who, when nobody else then did it, talked persistently of a World Congress and a World Court; and the plan was known in popular European parlance as "the American plan,"—and that American plan is now realized under our eyes. Baron d'Estournelles has said often and strongly in these days, that it was because America took the Hague Tribunal seriously, and first put it to use, that it came so quickly to honor and power. Other governments might have mediated between Russia and Japan, but the American government did it, and the most terrible of modern wars, there on the plains of Asia, was brought to an end at Kittery Navy Yard. Our Secretary of State and the American people know well that these services pale beside the service of the government which shall first efficiently lead the nations in the way of emancipation from the crushing burden of armaments under which now they stagger; and America's part in the coming Conference will be no inefficient or perfunctory part.

"All the other items of the Hague program," says Baron d'Estournelles, "will be insignificant compared with the limitation of armaments, for which the whole world is waiting." I do not agree with this strong statement; but I am glad that so strong a statement has been made by so strong a man on so conspicuous an occasion, because it compels sharp thought precisely where that is imperative. There are necessary things logically and practically prior to disarmament or to any large reduction of armaments. A uniform system of arbitration is prior; an adequate international court is prior; a recognized code of international law is prior. But Baron d'Estournelles is right in seeing that all these things are now certain and immediately certain, and that the development of all is now so far advanced that the refusal by the coöperating nations to stop the increase of their armaments while the work of perfecting proceeds not only reveals a terrible insensibility to the burden which these great armaments impose upon their people, but implies in powerful quarters a lack of the sincerity and faithful seriousness which are essential to all advance. He is right in seeing that, as the International Tribunal has come, so the International Parliament is assured, will doubtless be decreed the present year, through the simple provision that the meetings of the Hague Conference itself shall hereafter be regular. All these things are confidently accepted. Sustained effort will be demanded for the perfecting of each; but the

effort for none of them demands any longer vision nor much virtue. The battles for all, as was said at Mohonk last year of the battle for arbitration, "have been fought and won." But thousands of conventional men who now applaud arbitration and the Hague Tribunal and an International Parliament, because they are substantially achieved, reluctant instantly when armaments are touched. With the great navies and armies are bound up all the prides and prejudices, the ambitions and greeds, of a false and selfish patriotism; and to-day's virtue is in firmly and manfully meeting this source of to-day's chief mischief and menace. It is only firm and virtuous action here that can prove the earnestness of nations in their effort to supplant the methods of force by the methods of justice, and hasten the development of the machinery of international law and order.

The American and English governments may fail to secure any large definite results from the consideration of this matter at the coming Conference. But consideration itself, the frank and resolute facing of the problem, is a result. It will make the next consideration more definite and fruitful, and repeated consideration is inevitable until the problem finds its rational solution. How large the practical results from the approaching discussion depends in high degree upon the public opinion of the world and its expression during the critical weeks before us. It depends chiefly upon the strength and earnestness of the popular support which the progressive governments receive from the people behind them as they go into the Conference. The American people in this hour will not fail. They will stand behind Secretary Root in the same confident spirit in which he is willing to lead. "The effort can be made. It may fail in this Conference, as it failed in the first, but if it fails one more step will have been taken toward ultimate success. Every great advance that civilization has made on its road from savagery has been upon stepping-stones of failure, and a good fight bravely lost for a sound principle is always a victory."

BOSTON, June 20, 1907.

Whittier, the Poet of Peace.

Two-minute address made by Benjamin F. Trueblood at the unveiling of the Whittier tablet in the Hall of Fame, New York, on May 30.

"'Hate hath no harm for Love,' so ran the Song;
And peace unweaponed conquers every wrong."

Whittier was the Poet of Peace, because, more than any other American, he was the poet of Moral Force. He never wrote for art's sake, as Longfellow and Bayard Taylor did; nor for simple amusement, as Holmes often wrote; nor to embellish some philosophic thought, like Emerson; nor to surprise and stun, as Lowell seems sometimes to have done. His pen was always tipped with moral principles,—not the abstract principles of ethics, but the live, warm principles of ordinary human life, with its sufferings, its rights and its possible high destinies. Here, in men, everything with him centered. No one ever had a deeper, clearer conception of the intrinsic value of men, nor of the sacredness and inviolability of their persons and their rights. This made him the unalterable foe of everything that injured men or sacrificed their liberties. Thus his fine poetic gift, which reveled among the stars and delighted itself in the fascinations of nature, was

turned to the support of everything that blesses, and against everything that curses.

He opposed war for the same reason that he opposed slavery, because of its horrors, its cruelties, its injustices, and the base and ignoble passions which it usually springs out of, or, at any rate, always arouses. As he would not have held a slave for any earthly consideration, so he would not have gone to war and killed, or caused the killing of men, to save a race from slavery or even a nation from dismemberment, so loyal was he to duty as he conceived it. To have done so would have been, for him, to sacrifice the most binding and cherished moral principles that inspired and guided his life. His patriotism — and none ever had a finer and nobler love of country — had therefore to proceed in other ways than those marked by bloodshed and destruction.

He not only held war to be always wrong, but he also held moral principles — truth — to be the unfailing and speediest weapons for the overthrow of iniquity and the establishment of justice, if they were only faithfully used. Thus he sang of peace as the greatest glory of man, and of "the light, the truth, the love of Heaven" as the weapons divinely appointed for the conquest of the world.

In "The Peace Convention at Brussels," in "Disarmament," in the "Christmas Carmen," and in lines and stanzas here and there in many other poems, this marvelous poet of Moral Force, of the conquering power of Truth and Love, bids us

".... grasp the weapons He has given,
The Light, the Truth, and Love of Heaven;"

bids us

"Sing out the war-vulture and sing in the dove;"

bids us

"Lift in Christ's name his Cross against the sword;"

and inspires our hope and courage in the great "war against war," which is now everywhere on, with the sublime prophecy of "Disarmament," when

"Evil shall cease, and Violence pass away,
And the tired world breathe free through a long Sabbath day."

New Books

THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By Harold Bolce. New York. D. Appleton & Company. Cloth. 309 pages.

This is an admirably written and most readable book, whose purpose is to expound what the author calls the "financial and commercial amalgamation of the nations," and to show its power in bringing about the peace of the world. The new finance, the new commerce, the new spirit in the operation of continental railways and ocean fleets, are all a pledge to peace and to the promotion of the selling and purchasing power of the whole world. Mr. Bolce treats panics as among the greatest of international misfortunes, and contends that international and national business interests will some day perforce combine to prevent war-scares with their incalculable financial disturbances and losses, that "they will make a mockery of armaments," and that the New Internationalism of trade and finance will "refuse to finance wars" and compel "all mankind to turn bookkeeper and calculate profits." He makes much of reciprocity, as "the new law" of modern commerce, and embodies his thought on the advantages of this law in a chapter entitled "A Short